

REMARKS

As requested, a corrected Supplemental Declaration having the corrected title is concurrently filed herewith. In addition, priority to the parent U.S. application, which was claimed in the related application paragraph of the above-referenced application as filed, is now indicated in the corrected Supplemental Declaration. Furthermore, a Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a) and Transmittal of Declaration is concurrently filed herewith, to request that the above-referenced application be allowed to proceed without the co-inventor, Stefan Wickenkamp signing the corrected Supplemental Declaration.

With regard to the certified copies of the German priority document, please use the certified copy of German Patent Application No. 102 05 843.1, which was filed May 9, 2003 in the parent application (10/364,308, filed February 10, 2003). If the Examiner is unable to find the certified copy in the parent application, please notify the undersigned.

The Applicants point out that Patent No. 4,509,907 identified in the Background of the above-referenced application was cited by the Examiner on form PTO-892, and therefore, the filing of a separate Information Disclosure Statement by the Applicants is not necessary.

Applicants affirm that the claims of Group I (Claims 1-11 and 21) are elected for prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to file a continuing application or take such other appropriate action as deemed necessary to protect the non-elected inventions. Applicants do not hereby abandon or waive any rights in the non-elected inventions.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. In the Office Action at hand, Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are allowed, Claims 7, 11 and 21 are rejected, and Claims 12-20 are withdrawn from consideration. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of Claims 1-6 and 8-10.

Claim 7 has been amended to overcome the Section 112 rejection, and is in condition for allowance. No new matter is introduced.

Claims 11 and 21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,077,639 in view of Becker (U.S. 4,063,865). In addition, Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Sokolow (U.S. 3,899,276). In response to the double patenting rejection, Claims 11 and 21 have been amended to overcome the double patenting

rejection. In addition, in response to the Section 103(a) rejection, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21, as amended, is not obvious in view of Becker and Sokolow.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 11, as amended, recites a device for extruding hollow bodies including an inner collar, an outer collar and a middle collar. An interior web radially joins the inner collar to the middle collar. An exterior web radially joins the outer collar to the middle collar. The collars are arranged such that a linear borehole extends from the outside collar, through the middle collar, and into the inner collar, and through the exterior and interior webs. The exterior and interior webs are offset relative to each other about a common axis.

Claim 21, as amended, recites an apparatus for extrusion of hollow bodies including means for directing a melt around an interior web and an exterior web. Means are included for providing a linear borehole from the exterior web to the interior web. The exterior and interior webs are offset relative to each other about a common axis.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite that “a linear borehole extends from the outside collar, through the middle collar, and into the inner collar, and through the exterior and interior webs, the exterior and interior webs being offset relative to each other about a common axis,” and Claim 21 has been amended to recite “means for providing a linear borehole from the exterior web to the interior web, the exterior and interior webs being offset relative to each other about a common axis.” Support for these amendments is found at least in FIGs. 1-3, as well as on Page 3, line 5 through Page 4, line 8, and Page 4, line 22 through Page 5, line 12 of the Specification as originally filed. No new matter is introduced.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejections to Claims 11 and 21 are overcome by the amendments to Claims 11 and 21. Accordingly, Claim 11, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

With regard to the Section 103 rejection, Becker discloses in Column 1, lines 18-36 an extruder head having inner and outer rings connected together by radial webs. Becker does not disclose the orientation of the webs.

Sokolow discloses in FIG. 3 radial channels 47 extending through fingers 101 between channels 43.

Accordingly, Claim 21, as amended, is not obvious in view of Becker and Sokolow, since neither reference, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, "means for providing a linear borehole from the exterior web to the interior web, the exterior and interior webs being offset relative to each other about a common axis, as recited in Claim 21, as amended." Therefore, Claim 21, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By


Darrell L. Wong

Registration No. 36,725

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: October 16, 2007